REMARKS

Though not conceding to the Examiner's position Applicant has amended certain claims to better clarify Applicant's present invention.

In this response:

- Applicant has clarified certain aspects of the present invention related to the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections;
- Applicant has made clarifications, amendments, and arguments related to allowance of the claims and the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 rejections; and
- Applicant has added dependent claims 34-38. No fee under 37 C.F.R 1.16(i) is required as Applicant has previously paid for 24 totals claims and currently there are 24 claims pending.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 16-18, 25-27, 29, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. (Office Action item 5).

Claims 1, 25, and 29

The Examiner suggests *'... claims 1, 25, and 29 recite, "a plurality of core materials"* and suggests that *'the recitation is not clearly understood as the exact meaning of "core material"'*.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 25, and 29 to clarify *'core materials'* as *'core fibers forming a sling body'*. Applicant has also clarified 'coating material' as *'a coating'*.

The Examiner also suggests that in claims 1, 25, and 29 *'there is no antecedent basis for 'the thickness of said coating material'"*, the claims are vague as to how *"the thickness of said coating material"* is regulated in a predetermined pattern, and the Examiner suggests that it is unclear the meaning of *'predetermined pattern'*. The Examiner also suggests that Applicant fails to define *'the operational properties of a lifting sling'*.

In response Applicant has amended claims 1, 25, and 29 to clarify *'the thickness of said coating material'*, the meaning of *'predetermined'*, and clarifying *'the operational properties of a lifting sling'* by make the following amendment to independent claims 1, 25, and 29 *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thickness and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers, said coating thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body are selected based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling...'*

Claim 2

The Examiner suggests that claim 2 contradicts claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 2 and contends in view of Applicant's amendment and clarification the Examiner's suggestion is moot.

Claims 18, 25, and 29

The Examiner suggests that *'...the recitation of "and or" in claims 18, 25, and 29 are vague and indefinite...'* Applicant has amended claims 18, 25, and 29 and contends in view of Applicant's Amendment and clarification that the Examiner's suggestion is moot.

Claims 16 and 25

The Examiner suggests that claims 16 and 25 recite *'an electronic system being associated with core materials and the recitation is not clearly understood as to how 'an electronic system' is associated with 'core materials' of a sling. Similarly, claims 16 and 29 recite an indicator being associated with core material...'*.

In response, Applicant has reviewed the claims and does not find support for the Examiner's suggestion as claims 16, 25 and 29 do not recite *'an electronic system'* or *'an indicator ...is associated with core materials'*.

Support for Applicant's clarification and amendments can be found throughout Applicant's specification and figures. In view of Applicant's amendments and clarifications, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Barber, Jr. et al. (5,460,883). (Office Action item 7).

Applicant regards Applicant's present invention as coating of lifting slings with a polyurea elastomer, or hybrid polyurethane – polyurea elastomer. In addition, optionally the coating material can include one or more additives such as a catalyst, stabilizer, pigment, fire retardant, or other additives. In Applicant's present invention use of additives can enhance the lifting slings effectiveness and improve the operational condition and or suitability for use of the lifting sling. Applicant's present invention also relates to the ability to form a multi-core sling from a plurality of single cores. More specifically, the single cores can be tenaciously bonded together with the coating material to form a multi-core lifting sling. Applicant's present invention also relates to embedding a safety core along the length of the lifting sling core. The safety core allows monitoring of certain operational parameters related to the lifting sling by way of an indicator and or electronic system.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6

Applicant contends that Bassani '883 does not teach or suggest features that Applicant regards as patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references that is '*a plurality of core fibers forming a sling body*', '*... said coating material is at least an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea...*', and '*...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers, said coating thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body are selected based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling*' (independent claims 1, 25, and 29).

Barber teaches an extrusion method for use on long small diameter wires not a lifting sling as taught and claimed by Applicant. Applicant contends that Barber's long small diameter wires are different then Applicant's lifting sling comprising '*...a plurality of core fibers forming a sling body*'. Applicant further contends that Barber does not teach or suggest a lifting as taught and claimed by Applicant.

The Examiner, referring to Barber Col. 9, lines 2-11, and from Col. 11 line 65 to Col. 12, line 12, suggests that Barber teaches an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea. In actuality this is not the case. In fact Barber teaches just the opposite. Barber teaches that using an amine that forms urea cannot be used with his invention. Barber teaches in Col. 11, lines 53-64 that '*... although low molecular weigh polyfunctional amines ...are normally excellent chain extenders, they normally cannot be used in the segmented TPEs of the present invention because the resulting urea groups in the resulting TPE melt well above the useful processing range of the TPE and undergo some degradation on melting*'.

Furthermore, the reference section that the Examiner refers to, Barber Col. 11 line 65 to Col. 12, line 12 only serves to confirm that Barber does not teach or suggest Applicant's polyurea coating and that in fact Barber teaches away from Applicant's coating in that Barber teaches '*...Segmented TPEs useful in the composite abrasive filaments of the present invention preferably comprise segmented polyester TPEs, segmented polyurethane TPEs, and segmented polyamide TPEs...* '; not polyurea as taught and claimed by Applicant. Thus Applicant contends that Barber does not teach or suggest (and in fact Barber teaches away from) Applicant's '*...coating material is at least an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea*', as taught and claimed by Applicant.

The Examiner also suggests that Barber teaches an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea in Barber Col. 9, lines 2-11. Applicant sees no support for the Examiner's suggestion and contends that Barber does not teach what the Examiner is suggesting. In reviewing the referenced section Col. 9, lines 2-11 it appears Barber teaches some steps in combining abrasive particles with a coating material; nothing to do with an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea.

Applicant also notes that Barber does not teach and in fact teach away from Applicant's feature of *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling ...'* (independent claims 1, 25, and 29), in that Barber teaches an extrusion method for use on long small diameter wires. This extrusion method produces only uniform thickness across a length of wire, as the coating thickness is fixed in width by Barber's die (60) shown in figure 6. Furthermore, Barber teaches extruding long lengths of wire and rolling it onto spools. As such, it would be incongruent thinking to suggest Barber would contemplate that in some way Barber's wires would have varying coating thickness in certain sections of the same length of wire.

Applicant contends that the resultant is that the using Barber's die (60) makes it impractical if not impossible to vary coating thickness, as taught and claimed by Applicant. In contrast, Applicant in Applicant's figures 1J, 1K, and 1L and throughout Applicant's specification and starting on page 34, line 7 through page 36, line 9, how and why the *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core*

fibers, said coating thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body are selected based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling...'' (independent claims 1, 25, and 29). Therein Applicant teaches exemplary embodiments including in figure 1J, which illustrates *'...a uniform coating thickness'*, in figure 1K, which illustrates *'...a thicker coating can be placed on the end portions of the lifting sling 108...where excessive wear and tear on the lifting ends of the lifting sling 108 occurs'*, and in figure 1L, which illustrates *'the thickness of the coating ... tailored with a thicker coating in the center region of the lifting sling 108. A thicker coating in the center region of the lifting sling 108 can offer, for example and not limitation, increased resistance to heat, better puncture, scuff protection, better gripping, as well as allowing tailoring of other operational parameters'*.

As such, Applicant contends that Barber individually or in combination does not teach or suggest features or advantages that Applicant regards as patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references including *'a plurality of core fibers forming a sling body'*, *'... said coating material is at least an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea...'*, and *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers, said coating thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body are selected based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling'* (independent claims 1, 25, and 29). Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection(s) and allow claims 1, 2, 5 and 6.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Barber, Jr. et al. (5,460,883). (Office Action item 9). The Examiner also rejected claims 1-10, 16, 18, 29, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Germain (5,651,572) in view of either Bassani (4,098,861) or Barber, Jr. et al. (5,460,883) (Office Action Item 10). The Examiner also rejected claim 17 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Germain (5,651,572) and either Bassani (4,098,861) or Barber, Jr. et al. (5,460,883) as applied to claims 1, 16 and further in view of Smith et al. (6,443,660) (Office Action Item 11).

Claims 3 and 4

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Barber, Jr. et al. (5,460,883). The Examiner acknowledges that Barber does not teach the operating temperature and the strength of the coating material. However the Examiner suggests that *'it would have been obvious...to provide a reasonable operating temperature, which is below a melting point, and a desired tensile strength on the Barber to provide a reliable and operable device.'* (Office Action Item 9).

Applicant contends that the Examiner's reference is not relevant to Applicant's present invention and that in contrast, when Applicant refers to *'achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling'* (independent claims 1, 25, and 29) that this is post manufactured and refers to *'certain properties or characteristics exhibited during operational usage*

of the lifting sling, resultant from the careful design and manufacture of the lifting sling including, for example and not a limitation, selection of the lifting sling core fibers, selection of the coating thickness and varied coating thickness along the lifting sling body core fibers in predetermined patterns, as well as other coating characteristics exhibited when additives are mixed into the coating, to name a few.'. Barber makes no such mention on post manufacture operating temperatures and does not teach or suggest Applicant's *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers, said coating thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body are selected based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling'* (independent claims 1, 25, and 29).

Applicant contends that in view of Applicant's clarifications and remarks that claims 3 and 4 teach features or advantages that are patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection(s) and allow claims 3 and 4.

Claims 1-10, 16, 18, 29, 31, and 33

Claims 1-10, 16, 18, 29, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Germain (5,651,572) (Office Action item 10) in view in view of Bassani (4,098,861) or Barber, Jr. et al. (5,460,883). Applicant respectfully disagrees and contends that Barber Jr. et al. drawn to a short abrasive filament and Bassani drawn to coating lengths of small diameter wire do not teach Applicant's coating material and is non-analogous art when compared to St. Germain's sling and Applicant's lifting sling.

Furthermore, both Barber and Bassani teach extruding as a method of coating long lengths of small diameter wire. Applicant contends such technology has no relevance in the manufacture of lifting slings. As such, Applicant would further contend that there is no motivation and no reason to combine St. Germain's lifting sling and Barber's abrasive filament or Bassani's wire coating, and that even if such references were combined the resultant would be inoperable and still would not teach or suggest Applicant's lifting sling, as taught and claimed by Applicant.

Notwithstanding, the Examiner acknowledges that St. Germain does not teach an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea, as taught by Applicant.

The Examiner makes reference in the Office Action to Bassani mixing isocyanates and amines forming polyurethane (Col. 4, lines 9-35); however Bassani only teaches polyurethane coatings; not polyurea, as taught and claimed by Applicant. Applicant contends that Bassani does not teach *'coating material is at least an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea'*, as taught and claimed by Applicant.

The Examiner, referring to Barber Col. 9, lines 2-11, and from Col. 11 line 65 to Col. 12, line 12, suggests that Barber teaches an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea. As mentioned above in actuality this is not the case. In fact Barber teaches just the opposite. Barber teaches that using an amine that forms urea cannot be used with his invention. Barber teaches in Col. 11, lines 53-64 that *'... although low molecular weigh polyfunctional amines ...are normally excellent chain extenders, they normally cannot be used in the segmented TPEs of*

the present invention because the resulting urea groups in the resulting TPE melt well above the useful processing range of the TPE and undergo some degradation on melting'.

Furthermore, the reference section that the Examiner refers to, Barber Col. 11 line 65 to Col. 12, line 12 only serves to confirm that Barber does not teach or suggest Applicant's polyurea coating and that in fact Barber teaches away from Applicant's coating in that Barber teaches *'...Segmented TPEs useful in the composite abrasive filaments of the present invention preferably comprise segmented polyester TPEs, segmented polyurethane TPEs, and segmented polyamide TPEs...'*; not polyurea as taught and claimed by Applicant. Thus Applicant contends that Barber does not teach or suggest (and in fact Barber teaches away from) Applicant's *'...coating material is at least an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea'*, as taught and claimed by Applicant.

The Examiner also suggests that Barber teaches an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea in Barber Col. 9, lines 2-11. Applicant sees no support for the Examiner's suggestion and contends that Barber does not teach what the Examiner is suggesting. In reviewing the referenced section Col. 9, lines 2-11 it appears Barber teaches some steps in combining abrasive particles with a coating material; nothing to do with an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea.

As such, Applicant contends that Barber or Bassani individually or in combination do not teach or suggest features or advantages that Applicant regards as patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references that is *'...coating material is at least an isocyanate mixed with an amine forming polyurea'*.

Regarding claim 3 and 4, the Examiner also suggests that Bassani teaches *'the temperature of the components ranges from 80 to about 200C degrees and the pressure ranges from 200psi to about 3500psi'* (Bassani Col. 3, lines 48-52). The Examiner further suggests *'that it would have been obvious to provide a reasonable operating temperature, which is below a melting point, and a desired tensile strength on the Bassani or Barber to provide a reliable and operable St. Germain sling'*. Applicant does not see how this has anything to do with Applicant's present invention.

Applicant contends that the Examiner's reference to Bassani Col. 3, lines 48-52 has to deal with a wire coater (10) device and the manufacture of putting a non-polyurea coating on a wire, where the temperature and pressure the Examiner references are referring to preheating components of a wire coater (10) shown in figure 1 and pressures of chemicals being fed into inlet ports (12, 14) in the wire coater (10). Applicant contends that this is in no way related to Applicant's post manufactured operational proprieties of Applicant's coating material after it has been applied to Applicant's lifting sling core materials, and in the context of operating the lifting sling in its useful service life, as taught and claimed by Applicant.

Applicant contends that the Examiner's reference is not relevant to Applicant's present invention and that in contrast, when Applicant refers to *'achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling'*(independent claims 1, 25, and 29) that this is post manufactured and refers to *'certain properties or characteristics exhibited during operational usage of the lifting sling, resultant from the careful design and manufacture of the lifting sling including, for example and not a limitation, selection of the lifting sling core*

fibers, selection of the coating thickness and varied coating thickness along the lifting sling body core fibers in predetermined patterns, as well as other coating characteristics exhibited when additives are mixed into the coating, to name a few.'

Applicant also notes that both Barber and Bassani teach away from Applicant's feature of the *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling ...'* (independent claims 1, 25, and 29), in that both Barber and Bassani teach an extrusion method for use on long small diameter wires. This extrusion method produces only uniform thickness across a length of wire, as the coating thickness is fixed in width by Barber's die (60) shown in figure 6 and Bassani's wire coater (10) fixture shown in figure 1. Furthermore, both Barber and Bassani teach extruding long lengths of wire and rolling it onto spools. As such, it would be incongruent thinking to suggest Barber or Bassani would contemplate that in some way their wires would have varying coating thickness in certain sections of the same length of wire.

Applicant contends, that the resultant is that the using Barber's die (60) or Bassani's wire coater (10) fixture makes it impractical if not impossible to vary coating thickness, as taught and claimed by Applicant. In contrast, Applicant in Applicant's figures 1J, 1K, and 1L and throughout Applicant's specification and starting on page 34, line 7 through page 36, line 9, how and why the *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers, said coating thicknesses and*

locations along length of said sling body are selected based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling... '. Therein Applicant teaches exemplary embodiments including in figure 1J, which illustrates *'...a uniform coating thickness'*, in figure 1K, which illustrates *'...a thicker coating can be placed on the end portions of the lifting sling 108...where excessive wear and tear on the lifting ends of the lifting sling 108 occurs'*, and in figure 1L, which illustrates *'the thickness of the coating ... tailored with a thicker coating in the center region of the lifting sling 108. A thicker coating in the center region of the lifting sling 108 can offer, for example and not limitation, increased resistance to heat, better puncture, scuff protection, better gripping, as well as allowing tailoring of other operational parameters'*.

As such, Applicant contends that St. Germain, Barber, or Bassani individually or in combination do not teach or suggest features or advantages that Applicant regards as patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references including the *'...said coating is applied in patterns of varying thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body achieving operational properties that extend suitability for use of said coating and said plurality of core fibers, said coating thicknesses and locations along length of said sling body are selected based in part on operating conditions of said lifting sling... '* (independent claims 1, 25, and 29).

Applicant contends that in view of Applicant's clarifications and remarks that claims 1-10, 16, 18, 29, 31, and 33 teach features or advantages that are patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection(s) and allow claims 1-10, 16, 18, 29, 31, and 33.

Claims 17 and 25-27

Claims 17 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Germain (5,651,572) and either Bassani (4,098,861) or Barber, Jr. et al. (5,460,883) as applied to claims 1, 16 and further in view of Smith et. al. (6,443,660) (Office Action Item 11).

The Examiner acknowledges St. Germain's lifting sling does not teach Applicant's electronic system but suggests that Smith et al. in some manner does. Applicant respectfully disagrees and contends that there is no motivation and no reason to combine St. Germain's sling with Smith's apparatus for manipulating objects underwater. Applicant further contends even if you did combine St. Germain's sling and Smith's underwater apparatus that the resultant would be inoperable and still would not teach or suggest Applicant's lifting sling.

In response, St. Germain teaches a round sling having a fiber optic strand (1) that emerges from the sling cover (5). A user can shine a flashlight into one end of the fiber optic strand (1) and determine if it can be seen at the other end of the fiber optic strand (1) (St. Germain Col. 3 lines 54-57). If the fiber optic strand (1) breaks, such that light cannot be seen at the other end of the fiber optic strand (1), St. Germain infers that the sling is damaged. Unrelated to the fiber optic strand (1) St. Germain teaches use of a piece of yarn (3, 4) that can be pulled inside the sling cover (5) if the sling is over stretched. St. Germain also teaches that core strands (7, 8) form the body of the sling.

With regards to Smith et al., Smith teaches an apparatus for manipulating an object (110) located proximate to an underwater floor. In this regard, Smith teaches a lifting frame (20), from which at least one sling (34) can be secured.

Smith teaches using linear variable displacement transducers 'LVDT' (42) attached to the lifting frame (20) to monitor the bending of object (110) (Col. 7 lines 17-18). Smith does not teach or suggest monitoring anything related to a lifting sling, as taught and claimed by Applicant.

Smith et al. also teaches that rods (42a) can be moveably mounted within the LVDT and contact object (110) (col. 4 lines 39-51.) and that load cells (41) can be connected to pad eyes (27) which are secured to the lifting frame (20) (Col. 4 lines 14-18). Furthermore, Smith et al. teaches how such load cells (41), and LVDT (42) can be connected to instrumentation that is located on the vessel or on the river bank (Col. 5 lines 34-67).

In contrast, Applicant teaches a lifting sling comprising a plurality of core fibers, a coating, and an electronics system. Applicant's electronic system *'...secured proximate to said plurality of core fibers ...'* in claim 16, 25, and 29. Applicant contends neither St. Germain nor Smith individually or in combination teaches or suggest this feature or advantage that Applicant regards as patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references.

Smith teaches that load cells (41) and LVDTs (42) may be connected to instrumentation on the vessel or river bank (Col. 5, lines 40-50). The Examiner suggests that *'it would have been obvious ... to provide an electronic monitoring system to connect to St. Germain's sling as taught by Smith'*. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant contends that there is no motivation and no reason to combine or modify Smith, as suggested by the Examiner; that is attempting to add Smith's vessel or river bank based instrumentation to St Germain's sling, as not only does Smith practices his invention underwater but Smith teaches rods (42) contacting the object (110) (Col. 4, lines 38-51) for the

purpose of monitoring the bending of object (110) (Col. 7, lines 17-29); Smith does not teach or suggest '*an electronic system secured proximate to said plurality of core fibers, wherein by way of said electronic system said lifting sling data communicates with a plurality of data processing devices or a plurality of global network based data processing resources*' (independent claim 25), as taught and claimed by Applicant.

Furthermore, Smith teaches first lowering the lifting frame (20) into place (Col. 3, lines 55-60 and figure 4) and then securing a multiplicity of slings (34) to the lifting frame (20) (Col. 4 lines 19-28 and figure 8). Applicant contends that it would be impractical underwater to try to monitor anything else besides the bending in object (110), much less the multiplicity of slings (34); and indeed Smith's system only teaches monitoring the bending in object (110). In addition, Applicant contends that Smith's vessel or river bank based instrumentation is only capable of monitoring the bend in object (110) and interconnects only with the lifting frame (20) in a limited manner as this is the inherent functionality of load cells (41) and LVDTs (42). Applicant further contends that Smith does not teach or suggest that Smith's vessel or river bank based instrumentation is capable of monitoring operational parameters of lifting sling core material, as taught and claimed by Applicant.

With regards to the Examiner's acknowledgment that St. Germain *'does not teach ... an electronic system having a plurality of data processing device or a plurality of global network based data processing resources'*, the Examiner implies that Smith's vessel or river bank based instrumentation in some manner does. Applicant contends that in no way does Smith's vessel or river bank based instrumentation or any other cited references individually or in combination compare to the improvements Applicant's present invention makes in the fields of

lifting slings and cargo management related to control, communication, and networking.

Furthermore, Applicant contends that none of the cited references including Smith teach or suggest individually or in combination any of Applicant's control, communication, or networking features, advantages, or applications. To emphasis this point Applicant would like to note that in Applicant's present invention, Applicant teaches:

- an electronic system 500 having a plurality of communication features and devices 544 (Applicant's figure 4A and Applicant's specification starting on page 51, line 4 through page 55, line 19);

- an electronic system 500 network that illustrates electronic system 500 data communication with a plurality of data communicating devices, and an electronic system 500 data communicating over a global network to remote global network based data processing resources (Applicant's figure 5 and Applicant's specification starting on page 56, line 5 through page 57, line 2); and

- a plurality of data communicating devices effectuating data communication between a plurality of data communicating devices and or over a global network (Applicant's figure 6 Applicant's specification starting on page 56, line 5 through page 57, line 2).

Applicant contends that in view of Applicant's clarifications and remarks that claims 17 and 25-27 teach features or advantages that are patentable, novel, and non-obvious in view of the art disclosed by the cited references. Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection(s) and allow claims 17 and 25-27.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of all claims 1-10, 16-18, 25-27, 29, 31and 33-38 listed above. Applicant submits that in view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance and requests early notification to this effect.

Respectfully Submitted,

H. Brock Kolls

Agent for Applicant

Reg. No. 42,757

Dated: February 11, 2008

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: February 11, 2008

H. Brock Kolls